



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

17

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/535,170	05/16/2005	Toong Chuan Yong	1237.P004US/ADR/ay	2404
38556 7590 11/16/2007 LAWRENCE Y.D. HO & ASSOCIATES PTE LTD 30 BIDEFORD ROAD, #02-02, THONGSIA BUILDING SINGAPORE, 229922 SINGAPORE			EXAMINER KENNY, DANIEL J	
			ART UNIT 3633	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 11/16/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/535,170	Applicant(s) YONG ET AL.	
	Examiner Dan Kenny	Art Unit 3633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 8/29/2007 was considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the scrap wood". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 1 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The terms "render" and "rendering", based on the definition provided by numerous dictionaries's, is not understood in the context of the claim, nor according to the information provided in the specification.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 16, being a method claim reciting the order of method steps, is unacceptably dependant on device claim 9.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Gall (1,887,814) in view of Tesek (2,020,044).

LeGall discloses a method of fabricating hollow doors of wood material, the method comprising:

Claim 1 - forming modular components (3) from wood material; and joining together the modular components to form at least one panel rib (latticework) wherein said modular components comprise engagement members (4), complementary engagement members (5) and connecting means (page 1, line 8).

The members taught by Le Gall do not expressly include forming the modular components from scrap wood. However, it is well known in the art to use scrap wood in this way. Reference Tesek teaching a door having a core (10) including scrap wood joined together to form a rib (30). Therefore, it would have been obvious and well within the level of one skilled in the art at the time the present invention was made to modify the door panel of Le Gall using the scrap wood joined together as taught by Tesek to provide greater control over material costs.

Claim 2 – The joining of said panel rib's said engagement members and said complementary engagement members do not require adhesive (any suitable means, page 1, line 8, includes "no adhesive" as broadly recited), due to complementary structures of said engagement members and said complementary engagement members.

Claim 3 – The method taught by LeGall modified by Tesek further comprises joining modular components of inadequate individual dimensions (the shorter scrap pieces taught by Tesek forming longer, more useful members).

Claim 4 - The engagement members and said complementary engagement members comprise notched components that are joined one to another (see Fig. 4 and 5).

Claim 5 – The method does not comprise assembling a latticework comprising panel ribs formed from modular components. The method taught by LeGall comprises just one matrix (latticework, as defined by LeGall). However, it has been held that to simply duplicate a component expressly found in the prior art requires only routine skill in the art.

Claim 6 – The method of assembling the latticework being performed within a frame for a hollow door.

Claim 7 – The method is not expressly disclosed as assembling said latticework before placing said latticework into a frame for a hollow door. However, it is considered a matter of design choice to perform the steps in this particular order.

Claim 8 – The method of assembling said latticework permit latticework of different configurations (page 1, lines 53-58).

Claim 9 – is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Gall in view of Tesek.

LeGall discloses a hollow door of wood material with at least one panel rib (latticework) joined from modular components (3) formed from wood material, said modular components comprising engagement members (4), complementary engagement members (5) and connecting means (page 1, line 8).

The members taught by Le Gall do not expressly include forming the modular components from scrap wood. However, it is well know in the art to use scrap wood in this way. Reference Tesek teaching a door having a core (10) including scrap wood joined together to form a rib (30). Therefore, it would have been obvious and well within the level of one skilled in the art at the time the present invention was made to modify the door panel of Le Gall using the scrap wood joined together as taught by Tesek to provide greater control over material costs.

Claim 10 – The joining of said panel rib's said engagement members and said complementary engagement members do not require adhesive due to complementary structures of said engagement members and said complementary engagement members.

Claim 11 – The panel rib further comprises modular components of inadequate individual dimensions to form said panel rib, wherein joining of said modular components and panel ribs of adequate dimensions to be fabricated.

Claim 12 – The engagement members and said complementary engagement members comprise notched components joined one to another.

Claim 13 - A hollow door in accordance to Claim 9, said connecting means comprise fasteners (any suitable means, page 1, line 8, encompasses fasteners).

Claim 14 – The reference does not comprise assembling a latticework comprising panel ribs formed from modular components. LeGall comprises just one matrix (latticework, as defined by LeGall). However, it has been held that to simply duplicate a component expressly found in the prior art requires only routine skill in the art.

Claim 15 – The latticework being within a frame for a hollow door.

Claim 16 – The door is not expressly disclosed as having the latticework assembling before placing said latticework into a frame. However, it is considered a matter of design choice to perform the steps in this particular order.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's assertions that "Tesek does not suggest or teaches any engagement member for joining together the scrap wood to form the core construction", that "Neither Le Gall nor Tesek discloses or suggests the desirability of the combination of a "hollow doors of wood material with at least one panel rib joined from modular components rendered from scrap wood material.", and that "the scrap woods in Tesek are glued together to form the solid structure of the door panel. There is no teaching or suggestion in Tesek of providing any modular component (formed by scrap wood) having engagement members, complementary engagement members and connecting means for forming the panel rib as claimed in the present invention.", first, it is not necessary to show any teaching at all, and second, if a teaching is shown, it need not be found expressly in the prior art itself. It can be found in the knowledge of a person having ordinary skill in the art.

Concerning whether the Le Gall-disclosed latticework rib, the configuration (notches) for assembling the strips shown in Figs. 3-6 are not suitable for assembling scrap wood to form door panel rib, such ribs are essentially identical to those of Applicant's claimed invention.

Finally, Examiner believes it is important for Applicant to recognize that, as outlined in the rejection of claims 5 and 14, the combination of the two cited references clearly shows all the claimed elements except a "latticework"

comprising panel ribs formed from modular components; latticework, understood to mean the grid, made up of the individual, generally "X" or "+" shaped "modular components, that makes up the core of the door; the LeGall-taught core essentially being made up of a latticework or grid comprising one large modular component.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dan Kenny whose telephone number is (571) 272-9951. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 9 am to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Chilcot can be reached on (571) 272-6777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DK : D.K.

11/8/2007


Jeanette Chapman
Primary Examiner